

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/657,755	MAPES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jeffrey T. Barton	1753	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Pending

 (1) Jeffrey T. Barton.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Harold Fox.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 3 July 2007
**Time:** 10 am
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*Obviousness-type double patenting over US 6,617,507*
**Claims discussed:**
**Prior art documents discussed:**
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Fox to request filing of a Terminal Disclaimer over US 6,617,507 to overcome the ODP rejection. Mr. Fox requested clarification of the ODP rejection on the record, via interview summary. In view of the amendment filed 20 June 2007, the ODP rejection of instant claims 14, 16-21, 23-27, and 44-51 would still be made over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,617,507. The only difference between instant claim 14 and claim 14 of US 6,617,507 is the recitation of abutting modules in the patent, which is also contemplated in the instant claims. (i.e. claim 44) The other instant claims largely correspond to the other dependent claims of US 6,617,507..